

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the arguments set forth fully below. In the Office Action mailed March 17, 2008, claims 1-30 have been rejected. In response, the Applicants have submitted the following remarks and amended claims 1-5, 7-8, 13, 15, 20 and 25. Accordingly, claims 1-30 are still pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amended claims and the remarks below.

### **Examiner Interview Summary**

On June 16, 2008 the undersigned and Examiner Huynh interviewed this case by telephone conference. Claim 1 was discussed in light of the Schoenberg reference, and the undersigned asserted that the Schoenberg reference does not teach a system including an enterprise 102 that submits input documents 110 and a specification 120 to a batch generator 140 that outputs a batch 150 that includes electronic files 152 and a description 154 suitable for being transported and stored in a data store 130. While no agreement was reached, the Examiner urged the undersigned to respond to the present Office Action for the Examiner's consideration. The above amendments are made pursuant to the Examiner interview.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 13 and 25 have been objected to due to informalities listed in the Office Action. By the above amendments, the Applicants have amended these claims to correct these informalities. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw her objections to these claims.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, within the Office Action the Examiner has identified some points in these claims for clarification. By the above amendments, the

Applicants have remedied these specific points of lack of clarity by amending the claims pursuant to the Examiner's suggestion on page 3 of the Office Action. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw her rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-14 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0111297 to Schoenberg (hereinafter Schoenberg). The Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

Schoenberg teaches a system including a token that originate in a host server of the Schoenberg system, upon input from a user at a remote location. Referring to Figure 2 of Schoenberg, the patient includes this token, that includes routing information for patient records, as a cover sheet to the patient documents and faxes these to a host system 214. The host system receives the cover page with the token and the documents 220, and reads the token on the cover page 222. The token tells the whole system where to insert the documents into the patient file in step 224. In other words, the token of the Schoenberg reference is a routing key for the set of patient medical documents such that those medical documents can be inserted into a data store or patient file at the host system.

In contrast to the teachings of Schoenberg, the system and method of the present application includes an enterprise 102 that transports a set of input documents 110 and a specification 120 to a conversion facility 104, such that a batch generator 140 is configured to receive such items and generate a batch 150 therefrom. As discussed in the interview, the input documents 110 are in a first format, that is not necessarily a paper document format, but can be paper documents, electronic files, or may be in another machine or human readable format (present application, paragraph 19, lines 2-3). The batch generator 140 converts the input documents 110 and specification 120 into a set of electronic files 152 and a description 154 of the same in a second format for appropriate storage in the data store 130. In other words, the present application converts input documents 110 and a specification 120 from a first location in a first format into a second format in a conversion facility 104, such that the

electronic files 152 and description 154 in the second format may be appropriately stored back in the data store 130 in the first location (enterprise 102). As described above in the discussion of Schoenberg, Schoenberg does not teach such functionality. In fact, referring to Figure 1 of the present application, the Schoenberg reference merely teaches a system that would operate most nearly to an enterprise 102 having a set of input documents 110 (patient documents) and a specification 120 (token) that are sent to a data store 130 (patient file), such that they may be appropriately stored in the data store 130 (patient file). In other words, Schoenberg does not teach a conversion facility 104 configured with a batch generator to convert a set of documents from a first format to a second format and appropriately store them in a data store 130, but rather only teaches a system whereby a token is transmitted with a set of documents in order to route those documents to the appropriate file storage area.

The independent claim 1 is directed to a method of integrating a plurality of input documents in a first format into a data store holding documents in a second format, the method comprising: supplying from an enterprise to a batch generator the plurality of input documents in the first format and a specification comprising instructions for creating a description of the documents and a batch of electronic images of the documents based on attributes of the documents and syntax rules for the description, wherein the attributes include document source information and document content information, and further wherein the specification originates from an enterprise, receiving the batch in the second format from the batch generator, receiving in the data store a description of the document generated responsive to the specification, and importing the batch in the second format into the data store responsive to the description. As discussed above, Schoenberg does not teach a conversion facility configured to convert a set of input documents and a specification into a set of electronic files and a description in order to appropriately store the electronic files and the description into a data store. For at least these reason the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Schoenberg.

Claims 2-3 and 7 are dependent upon the independent claim 1. As discussed above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Schoenberg. Accordingly, claims 2-3 and 7 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

As discussed in the Office Action, claims 8-9, 13-14 are for a system for the method claims 1-3 and 7, and are thereby allowable under the same rationale as discussed above with respect to the method claims 1-3 and 7.

As is also stated in the Office Action, claim 26 is for a computer product of method claims 1, and 5-6, and is thereby allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to the independent claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4-6, 10-12, 15-25 and 27-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenberg as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0215600 to Aridore et al. (hereinafter Aridore).

Because the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rely on the Schoenberg reference to teach the same limitations as discussed above with respect to the independent claims 1, 8 and 26, the Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims 15, 20 and 27 are allowable over the teachings of Schoenberg and Aridore, as the combination of these reference do not include a conversion facility configured to convert a set of input documents and a specification into a set of electronic files and a description in order to appropriately store the electronic files and the description into a data store. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims 15, 20 and 27 are allowable over the teachings of Schoenberg, Aridore and their combination.


Claims 4-6 and 10-12 are dependent upon the independent claims 1 and 8. As discussed above, the independent claims 1 and 8 are allowable over the teachings of Schoenberg. Accordingly, claims 4-6 and 10-12 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 16-19, 21-25 and 28-30 are dependent upon the independent claims 15, 20 and 27. As discussed above, the independent claims 15, 20 and 27 are allowable over the teachings of Schoenberg, Aridore and their combination. Accordingly, claims 16-19, 21-25 and 28-30 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Application No. 10/726,325  
Amendment Dated June 17, 2008  
Reply to Final Office Action of March 17, 2008

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at 414-271-7590 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,  
ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

By   
Christopher M. Scherer  
Reg. No. 50,655

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202  
Telephone: (414) 271-7590  
Facsimile: (414) 271-5770